

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4-7, 9, 11-14, 16 and 18-21 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 15 and 17 having been canceled by the Applicants' Preliminary Amendment filed January 6, 2004. Claims 2, 9 and 16 are amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 2, 4, 5-7, 9, 11-14, 16 and 18-21 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 22-24 of co-pending application No. 09/942,743; Claims 2, 4, 9, 11, 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Asao et al (US 20030107538); Claims 5, 12 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Asao et al in view of Hashimoto et al (6,295,043); and Claims 6-7, 13-14 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Asao et al in view of Hashimoto et al and Kuribayashi et al (4,709,995).

In response to the double patenting rejection, submitted herewith is a duly executed Terminal Disclaimer. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this ground for rejection has been overcome.

In light of the several other grounds for rejection, Claims 2, 9 and 16 have been amended to clarify the claimed invention and thereby more clearly distinguish patentability over the cited art. To that end, Claims 2, 9 and 16 have been amended to recite that the image signal for the last field in the second one of the two successive periods has an amplitude that depends on the amplitude of the image signal for the next frame. This feature finds support at page 26, lines 1-10 in the specification of this application, and thus does not raise a question of new matter.

Since none of the cited references disclose "the image signal for the last field in the second one of the two successive periods has an amplitude that depends on the amplitude of the image signal for the next frame," it is respectfully submitted that the remaining outstanding grounds for rejection of Claims 2, 4-7, 9, 11-14, 16 and 18-21 have been overcome and that Claims 2, 4-7, 9, 11-14, 16 and 18-21 patentably define over the cited art.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments, no further issues are believed to be outstanding and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\EHK\AMEND-RESPONSES\0039\24S\246188US-AM1.DOC